

TRANSFORMING INSTALLATIONS TO SERVE THE ARMY'S OBJECTIVE FORCE

MG Robert L. Van Antwerp and
MG Hans A. Van Winkle

Introduction

The Army's installations must be transformed to support new requirements of the Interim and the Objective Forces while continuing initiatives to modernize and sustain the current infrastructure. Already faced with major challenges in addressing substandard facilities with limited funds, we must now plan to house, train, and deploy our transformed units. Installations must be prepared to accommodate the new force structures as they emerge to ensure no compromise to readiness.

Under the Army Transformation Campaign Plan, the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (OACSIM) is responsible for installation transformation. The magnitude of changes that will be needed, and the speed with which installations must transform, demand innovative strategies from the Army leadership. Traditional business practices will not achieve installation transformation quickly enough to field the Objective Force.

Installation Report Card

Army installations are the platforms supporting Army readiness. They provide the places where our soldiers live, work, and train. Quality facilities and robust power projection platforms are essential to meet our combatant force requirements and soldier expectations.

The Army's inventory currently includes:

- 162,000 buildings totaling almost 1 billion square feet,
- 100,000 family housing units,
- 28,000 miles of paved roads,
- 12 million acres of land, and
- A physical plant with a replacement value of more than \$220 billion.

Over the years, the investment in maintenance and repair (M&R) for

this infrastructure has fallen far short of that needed to meet operational and quality standards. In the past 10 years, M&R has been funded at approximately 60 percent of that required. Further, funds appropriated for M&R and revitalization of facilities have been diverted to mission requirements. The result is that today we are a mission-ready military that is living, working, and training on installations with serious infrastructure problems.

The effects of underfunding have become worse as our facilities have aged. Many of our utility systems are more than 50 years old and have more than exceeded their expected life span. Failures are frequent and could be catastrophic should a gas line or water line fail.

While savings were achieved in previous Base Realignment and Closures (BRACs), the proceeds were cut from operation and maintenance budgets rather than being used to recapitalize bases that remained active. The state of these Army facilities, and the realization that fixing them is not affordable, has led to several DOD-directed privatization and outsourcing initiatives. These efforts seek to provide better quality for our critical facilities by leveraging appropriated funds with private capital. The Military Construction, Army (MCA) Program also has been re-focused on modernization, but we

*Army installations
are the platforms
supporting Army
readiness. They provide
the places
where our soldiers
live, work, and train.
Quality facilities and
robust power projection
platforms are essential
to meet our combatant
force requirements
and soldier expectations.*

*While savings were achieved
in previous Base Realignment and Closures,
the proceeds were cut
from operation and maintenance budgets
rather than being used
to recapitalize bases that remained active.*

continue to lose ground with respect to our facilities.

In addition to our decaying infrastructure, Army installations face many challenges in environmental stewardship. Since enactment of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1970, environmental regulations that impact installations have grown exponentially. Virtually every activity related to a base's mission is governed by one or more regulations. Further, DOD has unique environmental concerns with some of its lands. These concerns include noise, threatened and endangered species, and unexploded ordnance.

The Army is committed to maintaining an environmental ethic, but there is an associated cost. For environmental programs that deal with the present and future—compliance, conservation, pollution prevention, integrated training area management, and technology—annual funding is about \$700 million. For those programs dealing with past incidents—restoration, BRAC cleanup, and formerly used Defense sites—the cost is about \$800 million annually.

Many installations face growing regional issues with their neighbors. Urban growth and public pressure have in some cases resulted in lost training capability, which impacts readiness. Further, a heightened emphasis on homeland security may change installation-community dynamics.

Supporting Efforts

Our installations will be challenged to support the Interim and Objective Forces. The force structure, doctrine, and weapon systems of the Objective Force will differ greatly from those of the Legacy Force. This will change the types of facilities and support required on an installation, perhaps dramatically. These changes must happen in conjunction with privatization and other ongoing initiatives, and they must be timed to coincide with fielding the new units in a way that provides effective support when it is needed.

While Future Combat Systems (FCS) is an unknown at present, in keeping with transformation objectives, it can be expected to be medium-weight versus the current heavy or light units. The Objective Force will be faster, more survivable, and more deployable with a smaller logistical tail.

FCS will rely on technology for battlefield advantage. Our transformed installations must be able to support any technology and system that may emerge, including wireless Web-based communications to facilitate command and control, Web-based sensors and weapons, unmanned ground and aerial vehicles, robots, "smart" armor, and longer range munitions.

Our current training ranges and facilities were designed to support the Legacy Force. As requirements for the Interim Brigade Combat Team

and Objective Force evolve, training ranges must be adapted, or new ones built, to accommodate new weapon systems and doctrine. While virtual and constructive training will be incorporated into the soldier's experience, they will not replace the need for realistic field training. These new ranges must be integrated with the support facilities required for the new weapon systems.

Installations must also ensure that they can procure contract services and hire workers with the types of skills needed to support the transformed force. New technology to be fielded with FCS may demand different capabilities than are currently available in the local community. Planners will need to ensure that service providers are available to support the full spectrum of new requirements. These include all services related to design, construction, operation, and maintenance for both facilities and ranges.

Transformation Strategy

Recognizing the critical role installations play in the readiness, projection, and sustainment of forces, planners have a sense of urgency to put installation transformation in sync with the overall transformation effort. The strategy to do so has four primary components:

- *Plan the installation investments needed to support Legacy, Interim, and Objective Forces in*

conjunction with the ongoing efforts in each line of operation (LO) for Army transformation. Installation initiatives are covered in LO 12 in the overall transformation synchronization matrix. In this way, efforts involving installations can be cross-walked and integrated with the efforts to transform all other aspects of the Army. To support OACSIM, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has established a Program Manager for LO 12 to facilitate and manage this effort.

- *Clarify major issues with regard to installation transformation and create a consensus on the way ahead.* There is a need to kick-start the transformation process for installations. Perhaps the greatest challenge comes from the fact that we do not yet know the exact form and function of the objective units or their specific needs. That requires us to build flexibility into future installations to ensure that the evolving objective forces can be effectively served without continuous major changes in installation functions and character.

A seminar game was commissioned to bring together a diverse group to examine installation issues and develop an initial strategy for addressing transformation within the timeframe and potential support requirements of the Objective Force. The game involved players from the Services, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Army installation management community, other federal agencies, industry, and academia. It was designed and facilitated by Toffler Associates, an industry consultant in the areas of organizational change and adjustment. The game was conducted on Dec. 6, 2001, at the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory in Laurel, MD. (The article on Page 9 of this issue describes results of the game.)

- *Seek means to accelerate the installation acquisition process.* Given the continuing evolution of FCS and the Objective Force structure and doctrine, it is not possible to develop a specific template that describes the character and capabilities of objective installations. In addition, the timeframe for the current MCA process may preclude effective response to the needs of the Objective Force in time for installations to be ready for their arrival. The simulation based acquisition concept—in principle the approach being used for FCS—is a means to provide a greater in-depth analysis capability that can shorten timelines, give decisionmakers more comprehensive information on alternative approaches to changing installations, and provide integrated economic, environmental, and engineering perspectives. This effort is embodied in the Fort Future Technology Base Program underway in the U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center. (Fort Future is described in more detail in the article on Page 14 of this issue.) In addition to Fort Future tools, an installation battle lab (IBL) is being established to provide quick, in-depth analysis to support OACSIM. The IBL will allow task-oriented teams to deal with complex issues faced by the installation management community. It will also provide an initial focus for putting the Fort Future tools to work on interim and objective basing and master planning decision support.

- *Develop a more effective approach to management of installations.* This is being addressed through the new Transformation of Installation Management (TIM) organization recently announced by the Secretary of the Army. TIM will provide an installation management activity and regional centers to afford more effective planning and manage-

ment of installations. Activities on installations previously managed by the major command will now be handled by the TIM and resourced centrally through OACSIM. This is a major paradigm shift for the Army and the installation support community. Transformation of installations is being built into the TIM business process.

Conclusion

Future installations must be modeled in the context of continuous change. They need to be flexible enough to meet changing mission requirements while protecting the environment and providing excellent living and working conditions.

While transforming our installations presents formidable challenges, it also offers significant opportunities for improving how we manage our Army infrastructure in the future. By making strategic decisions now, we can effect unprecedented life-cycle management of our bases to ensure that they will continue to be responsive to the Nation's defense needs in the generations to come.

MG ROBERT L. VAN ANTWERP is Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management at HQDA. He holds an M.S. in mechanical engineering from the University of Michigan and an M.B.A. from Long Island University, NY.

MG HANS A. VAN WINKLE is Deputy Commanding General, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He has an M.S. in public policy from the University of California at Berkeley.
